

Remarks

Introduction

Claims 1-11 are pending in the above application. Claim 1-11 have been rejected, and Figures 1 - 8a have been objected to.

In addition, the drawings have been objected to “because the inadequate reproduction quality of Figures 1-8a hinder significant features of the claimed invention.” Accordingly, applicants have submitted replacement Figures 1 - 8a top ut this application in better condition for allowance.

By this amendment, applicants have amended claim 7 and cancelled claim 11.

Claim Rejections under Section 112

Claims 7 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 7 has been amended as to form. Applicants submit that Claim 7, as amended, particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter of the invention. Claim 11 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,700,809 to Lazar in view of JP 06-144,748 to Akira and U.S. Patent No. 3,631,942 to Brounn.

Lazar does not disclose or suggest stiffeners on the interior of the shell panels to provide suitable support as required by claim 1. As shown in the Figure of Lazar, the vertical corrugations, 69, 79 are on the outside of the shell panels 60, 70, not on the interior.

In addition, Akira does not show stiffeners on the interior of the shell panels to provide suitable support as required by claim 1. Akira only discloses corner pillars, not stiffeners on the interior of the shell panels.

The Examiner has asserted that "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include stiffeners as taught by Akira on the interior of the shell panels disclosed by Lazar to facilitate support." As stated above, in Akira pillars 3 and joints 4 are located at the corners and not stiffeners on the shell panels. In addition, there is no suggestion in Akira to adapt the corner pillars as stiffeners on the shell panels, let alone to adapt the corner pillars as stiffeners on the interior of the side panel. Indeed, the purpose of Akira was to replace side plates easily and to replace them with the fewest number of side plates, and therefore it would not

have been obvious to adapt the corner pillars in Akira as stiffeners without use of impermissible hindsight. Furthermore, it is submitted that it would not have been obvious at the time, where structural support elements were hidden out of view for aesthetic reasons.

To the extent the Examiner relies upon Official Notice to provide the missing claim limitation to support a case for obviousness, applicants request the Examiner to provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.104(d)(2).

In Broun, columns 38 and 39, and intermediate columns 60, 65 are described as rigidly connected to beams 34 and 35. There is no disclosure that the columns act as “stiffeners on the interior of [the] shell panels to provide suitable support.” Thus, the column in Brounn are connected to the beams 34 and 35 and perform differently than the claimed stiffeners.

In addition, neither Lazar, Akira, or Brounn disclose or suggest providing decorative panels between the stiffeners so as to maximize the interior space of the elevator cab.

The Examiner has asserted that “It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to mount decorative panels as taught by Brounn on the shell panels of the interior of the cab and between the stiffeners disclosed by Lazar to provide a decorative finish to the interior of the elevator cab.” In

each reference, any structure that may comprise a decorative finish is mounted on top of support structures, not in between. In addition, nowhere in the cited references is there any mention of providing the decorative finish in between stiffeners and provided on the inside of the shell panels to maximize the interior space of the elevator cab.

Applicants submit that nowhere in Lazar, Akira, or Brounn is there any suggestion or disclosure to provide “decorative panels mounted on [the] shell panels on the interior of [the] cab and mounted between [the] stiffener” as required by the claims. To the extent that the Examiner believes such combination is obvious in view of applicants’ disclosure, applicants submit that reliance on applicants’ disclosure or hindsight is improper. Furthermore, it is submitted that it would not have been obvious at the time, where structural support elements were hidden out of view for aesthetic reasons.

To the extent the examiner seeks to utilize personal knowledge as official notice, applicants request the Examiner to provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.104(d)(2).

Claim 2

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lazar, in view of Akira and Brounn, and further in view of U.S. patent No. 4,635,756 to Sherwood.

For at least the reasons disclosed above with regard to claim 1, Sherwood also does not disclose the subject matter of claim 2. In addition, Sherwood does not suggest or disclose the shell panels having “opening to the elevator shaft to provide ventilation through said stiffeners.” Sherwood only provides ventilation holes, and does not disclose the stiffeners on the inside of the shell panels, and decorative panels therebetween, whereby ventilation through the stiffeners would then be provided by openings in the shell panels, as required by the claims.

Claim 3

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lazar, in view of Akira, Brounn, and Sherwood, and further in view of JP 06-001569 to Norihisa.

For at least the reasons disclosed above with regard to claims 1 and 2, Norihisa also does not disclose the subject matter of claim 3. Specifically, Norihisa does not disclose or suggest “stiffeners on the interior of [the] shell panels to provide suitable support.” Accordingly, Norihisa does not disclose or suggest the stiffeners of claim 1, nor the stiffeners of claim 3 which are attached to the inside of the shell panels. Nor is there any disclosure in Norihisa that structures 25 are stiffeners as claimed. Furthermore, the structure 25 in Norihisa is shown as attached to the outside of an inner-wall structure, and thus Norihisa neither discloses nor suggests the subject matter in claim 3.

Claim 4

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lazar, in view of Akira, Brounn, and Sherwood.

For at least the reasons disclosed above with regard to claims 1 and 2, the subject matter of claim 4 is not obvious over the cited art. In addition, Brounn does not disclose or suggest providing decorative panels that are “approximately the same thickness as [the] vertical stiffeners and extend inwardly from [the] shell panels.”

Applicants submit that nowhere in Lazar, Akira, or Brounn is there any suggestion or disclosure of providing decorative panels that are “approximately the same thickness as [the] vertical stiffeners and extend inwardly from [the] shell panels”

Claims 5 - 11

Claims 5 - 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over combinations of Lazar, in view of Akira, Brounn, and Sherwood, Norihisa and/or U.S. Patent No. 6,145,630 to Friedman.

For at least the reasons disclosed above with regard to claims 1 - 4, none of the cited references disclose the subject matter of claims 5 - 11. Specifically, none of the references disclose or suggest “stiffeners on the interior of [the] shell panels to provide suitable support.”

For at least the above stated reasons, applicants submit that the subject matter of the pending claims is patentable over the cited art and respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims, as amended.

as required by claim 4.

Respectfully submitted,


Douglas C. Wyatt
Registration No. 43,293

Amendments to the Drawings

Please replace the current Drawings, which include Figures 1-8a, with the enclosed replacement Drawings, which include Figures 1-8a. The replacement drawings comprise 3 sheets, each identified in the top margin as "Replacement sheet."